1 2 3 4 5 6 7	LAURENCE PARADIS (STATE BAR NO. 12 ALEXIUS MARKWALDER (STATE BAR NO. 2 DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES 2001 Center St., Third Floor Berkeley, CA 94704 Telephone: (510) 665-8644 Facsimile: (510) 665-8511 TTY: (510) 665-8716 Email: general@dralegal.org  Attorneys for Plaintiffs	O.227004)	
8 9 10 11 12	BRUCE BEHRENS, Chief Counsel DAVID GOSSAGE, Deputy Chief Counsel G. MICHAEL HARRINGTON, Assistant Chief Counsel DAVID N. SANDLER (STATE BAR NO. 51499) 595 Market Street, Suite 1700, San Francisco, CA 94105 Mail: P.O. Box 7444, San Francisco, CA 94120-7444 Telephone: (415) 904-5700 Facsimile: (415) 904-2333		
13	Attorneys for Defendants		
14 15	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
16	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
17			
18			
19	CALIFORNIANS FOR DISABILITY RIGHTS, INC. ("CDR"), CALIFORNIA	Case No. C 06 5125	
20	COUNCIL OF THE BLIND ("CCB"), BEN ROCKWELL and DMITRI DELSER, on behalf of themselves, and on	STIPULATION RE EXCLUSION OF STUHR v. CALIFORNIA FROM THE	
21	BELSER, on behalf of themselves, and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	SCOPE OF THE CLASS AND <del>PROPOSED </del> ORDER	
22	Plaintiffs,	I VOI OPENI OKNEK	
23	v.		
24 25	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ("Caltrans") and WILL		
26	KEMPTON, in his official capacity.		
27	Defendants.		
28			
_			

Casconstantianum Cascon

## Cascaste 6:06-05-10251-28 BAD Document nt 31.4 Filled 1111/1029/2000 6 Page 2 3 of 3

1	Whereas, Disability Rights Advocates, on behalf of their clients Californians for		
2	Disability Rights, the California Council of the Blind, Ben Rockwell and Dmitri Belser, filed a		
3	class action lawsuit on August 23, 2006 in the Northern Federal District Court against the		
4	California Department of Transportation and Will Kempton (Case No. C-06-5125 SBA),		
5	alleging systemic accessibility violations along pedestrian rights of way and Park and Ride		
6	facilities across the state of California and under the jurisdiction of Caltrans;		
7	Whereas, Mark Potter, on behalf of his client Jeff Stuhr, filed a separate lawsuit on		
8	September 5, 2006 in the Superior Court for the County of Sonoma against the state of California		
9	(Case No. SCV 239273), alleging an inaccessible sidewalk with steps and no curb cut in front of		
10	18133 Sonoma Highway 12 in Sonoma County, California;		
11	Whereas, there is potential for overlap in the two lawsuits given that Plaintiff Stuhr		
12	would also be a class member in Case No. C-06-5125 SBA, if certified as a class action; and		
13	Whereas, Plaintiff Stuhr in Case No. SCV 239273 alleges and seeks monetary damages		
14	and Plaintiffs in Case No. C-06-5125 SBA seek only injunctive relief;		
15			
16	The undersigned parties, by and through their counsel of record, hereby stipulate and		
۱7	agree to the following:		
18	1. Should this Court in Case No. C-06-5125 SBA certify any class, the scope of said		
19	class will be restricted so as to exclude the barriers alleged in Case No. SCV 239273;		
20	2. The specific barriers to be excluded from Case No. C-06-5125 SBA are:		
21	a. The stairs located on the sidewalk in front of 18133 Sonoma Highway 12,		
22	Sonoma, California; and		
23	b. The missing curb ramp on the sidewalk in front of 18133 Sonoma		
24	Highway 12, Sonoma, California.		
25	SO STIPULATED.		
26	/		
27			
8			

jt.	tt.		
, w	Cases 6:06-05-10251-2888BAD 100000	memetrit31.4 FFileed 1111/002/2000 6Page 3 @ 83 of 3	
1	DATED: October 3/, 2006	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	
2		David N. Jandler	
3		Attorneys for Defendants	
4	DATED: October 2, 2006		
5	DATED: October 2, 2006	DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES	
6	_	W/2/	
7		Mary-Lee É. Kimber Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
8			
9		(Proposed) ORDER	
10	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
11	III IS SO GREEKIES.		
12	Dated: <u>11/9/06</u>	HONORABLE SAUNDRA B. ARMSTRONG	
13	Ĵ	J.S. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE	
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27	\\Server\cases\CDR.CalTrans\Pleadings\Stipulations\Stip_StuhrCarveOut.doc		
28			
	Californians for Disability Rights, Inc. v. California Department of Transportation, Case No.: C 06 5125 STIPULATION RE EXCLUSION OF STUHR v. CALIFORNIA FROM THE SCOPE OF THE CLASS AND [PROPOSED] ORDER		